The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government and the Economy of Life

VOL. I. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 18[illegible] NO. 47

The Principia.

Published Weekly, at [illegible] Street, [illegible] doors above [illegible], New-York.

William Goodell, Editor.

Samuel Wilde, Proprietor.

Terms: One dollar a year, in advance.

[illegible] letters with [illegible], to

Melancthon B. Williams, [illegible] Agent, as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote [illegible], [illegible] Christian [illegible], the [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] traffic [illegible] kindred [illegible] application of [illegible] to all the relations of [illegible], [illegible] arrangements and aims of life—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of [illegible] God, restoring the [illegible] of man, and [illegible] of heaven. Our text book is the Bible, our standard the Divine law, our expedient, obedience, our plan the Gospel, our trust, the Divine promises, our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

WILLIAM GOODELL TO GERRIT SMITH.

SECOND LETTER.

To Gerrit Smith.—My good friend—My former Letter was devoted to the defense of my "Reasons No. one, two, three, four and five"—as you designate them against your *seeming* attempt to prove that no such Reasons were ever entertained by me, as I had alleged in my Review of your Letter to the Syracuse Convention. My present Letter will still further confirm the verity—aye, and the soundness—of my "Reason No. Five," and by the same facts and considerations will show by *What* and by *Whom* the Liberty party will have been theologically severed, if thus severed at all.

You exclaim,

> "And so Orthodoxy must be the dividing line"—"Very sad and deeply mortified am I at this new division, and at these new demands of orthodoxy." And again, "O orthodoxy, how bewildering and misleading is thy power even over the wisest and best of men!"

WHAT THREATENS TO DIVIDE THE LIBERTY PARTY?

These words of yours I record here, as my warrant for entering thoroughly and historically into the questions—Who and what has set up a dividing line? Has Orthodoxy or has *Anti*-Orthodoxy done this?—What demands has Orthodoxy urged? By whom, where, when, and how have they been urged? And, on the other hand, What demands has *Anti*-Orthodoxy urged? By whom, when and where, have they been urged?

"ORTHODOXY" DOES NOT.

When, where, how, and by whom, has the question of orthodoxy or of its opposite been introduced into the field of political abolition—political liquor prohibition, or anything of the kind? Has "your old friend and fellow laborer" William Goodell, ever uttered a sylable, or made a movement in that direction? You will perhaps say that he did, in his Review of your Letter to the Syracuse Convention. You will not [illegible], [illegible] to that Review he ever said or did anything upon which you could hang a complaint of that kind. Certainly, not previous to the publication of the paragraph I quoted from your "Religion of Reason," [illegible] in this Letter [illegible] I close.

What then do you find in the Review that has any bearing on the subject? Scrutinize my Review as closely as you please, and you will find nothing at all, except a protest against the introduction of a polemic element into that political Convention! Your Letter now before me, and which I am now answering, [illegible] that you [illegible] and that you found in that Review [illegible] theological [illegible] should be made of the Liberty party [illegible]. You state my "Reason No. Five" [illegible] as follows, namely:

> "[illegible] purpose to pursue [illegible] contrary to the Religion of [illegible]."

What "new demands of orthodoxy" do you find here?—What demands—new or old, but that theological or political [illegible] "orthodoxy" on the one hand and the "Religion of Reason" so called on the other, should not be made a dividing line in the Liberty party? Nothing! You can find nothing.

Your Letter shows that you found nothing. It quotes nothing. It alludes to nothing. It would have done so if my Review had contained anything of the kind.

How, then, did you make out your case against me? From *whence* did you derive your warrant for the exclamations above quoted? The assumption that "*Orthodoxy* is to be the dividing line" &c. &c.?

Not from my Review, most assuredly. You not merely admitted—(that term is too feeble)—you *insisted*, throughout your Letter, that THE REVIEW contained NOTHING that could have been a "Reason" in my own mind, for the conclusion to which I had arrived, namely, that it was not wisest and best that I should vote for you. And so, as I showed, in my former Letter, you had to *go out* of my Review, which you had reduced to a cypher, in order to find *the one reason* why I decline voting for you.—That reason which, as I said, you kindly manufactured for me—inasmuch as I was so "self deceived" that I knew nothing about it *myself*, was thus stated by you—

> "The one reason, as his Review so plainly shows, which has wrought this great change in my old and dear friend, is that he has lost all patience with what he regards my religion."

How does my "Review plainly show it?" You had analyzed my "Reasons" one by one, especially the "Reason No. Five" (omitting, as I said, before, my quotation from your "Religion of Reason") and your Report was, that there was not one of them in which you could find "*the* one true reason" which you manufactured for me!

You construe my Review, very much as many do the Federal Constitution, by ignoring what is *in* it, and then going *out side* of it, to find the true meaning. The *words* that make "Orthodoxy the dividing line" and that "set up new demands for orthodoxy," are not there. No—Nor in any other utterances or acts of mine, by which you could thus construe my Review, or read it into such a meaning. And so you resort to *supposed intentions*! You discover, what I had not told you—nay, what I was, by your own account, ignorant of, myself, being "self-deceived"—namely, that I had "lost all patience with what I regarded your religion."

Unlike the pro-slavery expounders of the Constitution, however, after having gone out of my Review to find, its true meaning, which you say it "plainly shows," you do not attempt to fall back, as do those expounders, upon *historical* data, on which to make plausible your *out side* exposition of it. Without showing either the *words* or the historical *facts* which warrant your statement, that my "Review plainly shows" what you attribute to me, you [illegible] make the [illegible] and upon that statement solely, you raise the cry of [illegible] and of mortification that *orthodoxy* has [illegible] new division in the Liberty party.

[illegible] ANTI-ORTHODOXY THREATENED THE DIVISION?

[illegible] other direction for "new demands" of a theological or anti-theological character threatening a new division in the Liberty party.

In doing this, I shall be obliged to make various extracts from your "Three Discourses on the Religion of Reason," or rather, [illegible] from the Third and last of them, as [illegible] by you.

And [illegible], [illegible], up to the date of that Third Discourse, June 19th, 1859, no [illegible] had been made from any quarter, certainly not from any "orthodox" source within my knowledge, that in our political action against slavery, intemperance, War &c. &c. any theological distinctions were to be set up among those of us who were engaged in such enterprises, still less that any of the various theological systems were to be "superseded" by either of them, before any thorough or permanent political reformations could be expected. You yourself, say in your Letter before me, that it was "only until recently"—until "the late Syracuse Convention," that you discovered any "danger" of such a division.—Not until then did the orthodox hesitate to vote for you. More than this you might say. No theological appeals from prominent "orthodox" members or recognized leaders of the Liberty party to the friends of Temperance, Freedom, Peace and political reformation urging upon them the necessity of such a theological revolution, in order to political success, had previously been made. By whom then, had it been done?

Gerrit Smith, more than any other man, was a recognized leader—if not *the* leader of the Liberty party, which was, and still is, commonly called after his name, "the Gerrit Smith party."—And in his discourse of June 19th 1859, on "The Religion of Reason," Gerrit Smith annunciated his views not of THEOLOGY merely but of RELIGION notwithstanding the broad distinction he sometimes makes between them, as though there could be the latter without the former.

GERRIT SMITH'S RELIGION OF REASON.

I shall now proceed to quote from that Discourse, and it will be seen, before I have done, whether you did, or did not, set up a theological test in politics, in which some of the leading principles, (as you stated them) of the orthodox Religion are decried, the ground taken that no extensive or permanent *political reform* can be effected till they are "superseded" by the so-called "Religion of Reason"—and *political reformers* virtually urged to take their position accordingly—which position if taken by you and those of your theological views, would necessitate a division in the Liberty party, of course, unless all its members should come into the measure.

CONNECTION BETWEEN THEOLOGY AND RELIGION.

Your Third Discourse commences thus:—

> "What is true Religion? No other question propounded to mortals is so important. Answered, however, it easily can be, if only the true God is known. For, wherever he is known, there also is the true religion known. The religion of a people necessarily adjusts itself to their apprehensions of God. Know they the true God? then have they the true religion. But [illegible] they know him not. [illegible] the question to [illegible] which we [illegible] What is the true [illegible]?" p. 44.

This is excellent. It is orthodox. It is [illegible] feature of orthodoxy the preaching of which always brings [illegible] upon orthodoxy as being an [illegible], narrow [illegible]. It is a direct contradiction of the common [illegible] that a people may have the true religion without having the true Theology. For "Theology is the science of God and Divine things or the science which teaches the existence, character and attributes of God, his laws and government, the doctrines we are to believe and the duties we are to practice" (Webster). There is no [illegible] to Religion that is not [illegible] of Theology, that is not a [illegible] to be [illegible] God. [illegible] be [illegible]. We will keep this in mind, as I proceed with my [illegible] of what you say concerning "the prevailing religion"—the [illegible] and "the popular [illegible]." It will be seen that you [illegible] "religion" with "Theology" [illegible]—[illegible] we may [illegible]. [illegible] that [illegible], however excellent and [illegible], makes a [illegible], [illegible] formed [illegible]. [illegible] that

a man has the true religion any further than as he has right apprehensions of God—of his attributes, of his character? [illegible] In the next paragraph, you have stated

THE SCRIPTURES.

How is his character to be ascertained? Where shall we go for the necessary information? You answer

"Not to books, written by men, but to books written by God—[illegible] stars and earth. For not only [illegible] a [illegible] by the things that are made, but [illegible] can be understood." p. 44.

Here you repudiate the Bible, as a book of divine origin and authority. You make it a work of *man*, in contrast with the works of *God*, in creation. You thereby repudiate one of the [illegible] of the "Orthodox" theology, and consequently of the "Orthodox" religion. For it is "the *Religion* of [illegible]"—not merely, its *Theology*, that you are [illegible], in opposition to the *Religion* as well as to the *Theology* of Orthodoxy. And the very first paragraph of your Discourse, which I have already quoted, characterizes every man's *Religion* by his *Theology*.

POINTS TO BE KEPT IN MIND.

I notice this, and I continue my quotations, not for the purpose of discussing, to any extent, at *present*, the comparative merits or demerits of the two religions, much less for any purpose of exciting a theological odium against you, though my extracts will show whether you have not employed your eloquence to excite theological odium against *my* theology *and* religion, which, (I repeat it, and the extracts I shall make, will show it) you have perseveringly connected together, as inseperable.—But I am making these extracts to show (1) What your "Religion of Reason" as contra-distinguished from the Religion of Orthodoxy is—(2) The radical difference and opposition that, in your own view, there exists between them—(3) the insurmountable obstacles in your own mind, to any permanent and extensive reforms, politically, or otherwise, until the religion of "orthodoxy" shall have "supplanted by your "Religion of Reason—(4.) Your appeal to Reformers on that subject—(5.) the necessary connexion between all these, and your late Letter to the political nominating Convention at Syracuse, in which you were nominated for President of the United States, notwithstanding your declarations that, in your own view, neither the cause of *abolition*, nor the cause of *Temperance*—neither the *Slave* nor the *inebriate*, were to receive any essential benefits by it. (6.) And finally, what you *did* propose as the principal thing to be effected by "presses and lecturers."—I proceed in my quotations:

VERSUS THE BIBLE AND "ORTHODOXY."

"It is not true that death is a curse, nor that it is so much as a calamity. That it is a penalty, is purely a theological fiction." p. 45.

That sin came into the world, and death by sin, that death has passed upon all men, because all have sinned, is, in your view, a theological heresy, one element, of course, of false religion. I quote again.

"I do not forget that such crimes as burning the widow and casting the [illegible] the river, are cited to prove that human nature is [illegible] and base. These are crimes not of, but against human nature. They express its perversions, not itself. The religions of the world, are mainly responsible for this class of crimes. It is [illegible] that have, in all lands and ages, outraged human nature [illegible] created monsters, to take its place, and [illegible]. Most of the great crimes (slavery in India) which have disgraced and crushed mankind, have been committed, [illegible] in the name of [illegible] directly or indirectly [illegible] the plea of its sanction."

The "religions of all lands and ages, are here classed together, and together condemned. The crimes that are "perversions of nature, and "against" it, are *not* spoken of as "perversions" of any of these religions, nor as being "against them." So far as "Orthodoxy" is concerned, we shall see more of this, as we proceed.

"When we are told that God could not forgive [illegible] until His anger [illegible] and His law [illegible], by the suffering [illegible] we reply that [illegible] of Him and of His [illegible] not [illegible] what we learn of Him and [illegible] the upward and [illegible]. But [illegible] of the moral nature [illegible]." p. 4[illegible].

The doctrine of the Atonement, as held by the "Orthodox," or "Evangelical" is then, in your view, *another* Theological heresy, another element in their false religion.

FURTHER HERESIES OF "ORTHODOXY."

Again you say

"When [illegible] we [illegible] eternal [illegible] [illegible] for a long [illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible] Calvinism and Presbyterianism. These [illegible]." p. 4[illegible].

And so the "Orthodox" doctrine of everlasting punishment where "their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched," (the very words of Jesus Christ) is another theological fiction—a heresy—another element of the false religion of the orthodox—a religion that worships a "fiend!" And you [illegible] the religion of the people, [illegible] the [illegible] of that."

ORTHODOXY HYPOCRISY OR INSANITY.

A little further on, you exclaim:—

"Punishment [illegible] eternal [illegible]. Why, the worst [illegible] would not thus serve [illegible] worst [illegible]. How much [illegible] would God! Orthodoxy makes [illegible] infinitely more malignant [illegible] than are the [illegible] malignant and cruel of men. "[illegible]!" No man does, and no man can [illegible] it. It is untrue, [illegible] because human nature is incapable of [illegible] it." [illegible] orthodox preacher of an eternal hell, would himself go crazy, could he believe his own preaching. Had he [illegible] his wife, or children, or friends, or neighbors in danger of falling into it, he would be overpowered by the sight. He saves his sanity, only through his insincerity. To be sincere in his preaching, he must first be insane." p. 51.

In the same connection, and on the same page you say

"The little influence of religion on its professors, is often wondered at. But why should it not be so? They do not believe their religion, and they cannot, so long as an eternal hell is a part of it." . . . Herein is the explanation of the fact, that while an ignorant Church is little better than a mass of superstition, a more enlightened one is little better than a mass of infidelity and hypocrisy. The members of the latter, required to believe in more than their credulity can swallow, do truly and deeply believe in nothing and thus are they infidels. Moreover they are very great hypocrites, since they stoutly profess to believe it all." p. 51.

And so all the orthodox, except the insane, are insincere. All the more "enlightened," in distinction from the "ignorant and superstitious" among them, are "hypocrites." Such is your "liberality," such your "charity" toward those who, at this point, disagree with you, in your theology. You make a sweeping work of it, among the great majority of your "dear old friends and fellow laborers," in the cause of freedom and temperance."

IMMORAL INFLUENCE OF "ORTHODOXY."

Now, for your views of the moral influence of their religion. You add, in the same connection.

"We are wont to lament the prevailing want of religious earnestness. But should we not rather rejoice in it, seeing how monstrous are the religions? With what stomach we should hate, and crush, and kill one another, if we really believed we were such devils as our religions picture us to be! Once persuade me that God is waiting to roast my neighbor, and the way is easier for persuading me, that I shall do God service by hurrying that neighbor with a dagger, or a bullet, into the prepared fire." P. 51.

"I can hardly think that your *reasoning* powers, here, should be charged with the conclusion to which you have arrived. I should attribute it rather to your excited feelings, and brilliant imagination. If *sober reason* can do no better than this, I should find in it a new evidence of the necessity of a divine revelation. Suppose I should argue that those who doubt or disbelieve a future existence, would feel no compunction, and fear no retribution for murdering a man more than for taking the life of an animal. Or that those who believe death to be, in all cases, the gate to endless happiness, would think it a benevolent deed to kill everybody. Would you admit the conclusiveness of my logic?

WHY IT MUST BE SUPERCEDED?

Is it difficult in the light of this, to understand *what* Religion it is, that you afterwards say must be "superceded" by your "Religion of Reason," before any "extensive and permanent political reforms" can be completed? Is it difficult to guess what sort of teaching you would require of "the presses and lecturers" the support of whom you recommended to the political nominating convention at Syracuse, by which you were nominated, as being more important than any direct efforts and expenditures to obtain votes against the *Rum traffic* and against *Slavery*.

Let me keep your attention to your continual use of the word "Religion," as in the above paragraph, connection, or rather identifying *Religion* with *Theology*, notwithstanding the separation you sometimes insist on between them. As for example, in your late letter to me, you say.

"[illegible] true that [illegible] which you regard as [illegible] part of [illegible] my eye, no part [illegible] &c. &c.

Your Discourse on the Religion of Reason and against Orthodoxy [illegible] with a [illegible]. Its whole force and effect for any practical purpose, would have been paralyzed by such a concession.

THE BIBLE AGAIN.

You proceed in your very next paragraph

"[illegible] that [illegible] would [illegible] and Providence are affirmed by [illegible] are. Certainly they are not by the Bible [illegible] they would [illegible] that, so far the Bible is [illegible]

"But is not the Bible the word of God? [illegible] as it corresponds with [illegible] by nature [illegible]

"But is not the Bible [illegible] Christ, from [illegible] would [illegible] No courage [illegible] part [illegible] No [illegible] fa[illegible] and [illegible] The [illegible] book [illegible]." p. [illegible].

Such are your views of the Bible, through, (referring to the Old Testament Scriptures). Jesus Christ called them the "word of God," and said "the Scripture cannot be broken," appealing continually to them for the evidences of His own Messiahship, and declaring that their predictions concerning Him must all be fulfilled. But this is no conclusive authority with you, for you tell us on pages [illegible] that in some of the teachings of Jesus Christ, he was mistaken.

In connection with what you say of the Bible as last quoted, you add.

"What, however [illegible] the Bible, or rather a Book that we are bound to adopt the whole of it unquestioningly, and to worship it, and to insist that there is not in the whole of it, one unsound doctrine, nor one false sentiment!" p. [illegible].

There is one class of passages in the Bible, of which the most firm believers in its plenary inspiration, may and do admit that they contain "unsound doctrines and false sentiments," and yet the admission is not inconsistent with their belief. As where the Bible *records the fact* that Satan uttered the falsehood.—"Ye shall not surely die"—where the three friends of Job disputed together, and, of course *some* of them were wrong in their "sentiments"—and where Solomon, under guidance of Divine inspiratian, relates, for the warning of mankind, some of his former skeptical "sentiments," and his present "conclusion of the whole matter." *The record*, according to the orthodox belief, was directed by God, to be made. Yet learned opponents of orthodoxy, strange to say, have seriously and triumphantly adduced these passages, as conclusive refutation of the doctrine of plenary inspiration!

A very sad exemplification of the all-sufficiency of human reason!

MISCHIEFS OF A FULL BELIEF IN THE BIBLE.

And, in anticipation of a good time coming—(notwithstanding your discouragement as a reformer,)—a good time when the authority of the Bible as a whole, and as being God's word, shall no longer be recognized, you seem almost gifted with the spirit of triumphant prophecy, and you exclaim:

"Then, for the first time the soul-darkening, soul-shriveling, and soul-enslaving religion of authority, would begin to give place in them (the "Millions,") to the soul-enlightening, soul-expanding, and soul-freeing religion of reason." p. [illegible].

Still further do you dilate on the mischiefs of receiving all Scripture, as being given by inspiration of God, profitable for doctrine, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work. You say

"Nature is the only authoritative instructor in our study of the character of God." p. 6[illegible].

"Hence it is explained that so many worthy people [illegible] that slavery is right. Instantly would they condemn it, were their moral sense allowed to pass upon it. But their moral sense, [illegible] theologians teach them is so blunted and [illegible] by their [illegible] as to make it necessary to supercede it by a revelation [illegible] a book."

"[illegible] story book [illegible] religion." p. 64.

"It is by means of books and their own [illegible] up these religions that make such [illegible] and [illegible] war upon human [illegible] and [illegible] it with [illegible] of their horrid [illegible] debasing and [illegible] superstitions and [illegible] of [illegible] obeyed, and a natural [illegible] take [illegible] arc [illegible] fan[illegible] the [illegible] cease and the deep wounds they have [illegible] quickly be healed [illegible] with the [illegible]."

What a marvel it is, my dear sir, that in none of these parts of the earth, wherein no book-religion has been taught to the people, has there been witnessed any of the blessed results you have described. What a marvel it is, that in none of those communities where [illegible] books, except that of the "books" that profess to teach the "Religion of Nature," has been taught to the people, has its very "fanciful picture" you have drawn, ever yet been re-

[illegible] is now [illegible] among us? [illegible] the [illegible] which [illegible] has not been [illegible] as God's word [illegible] Anti-Slavery [illegible] Temperance [illegible] Moral Reform Societies, [illegible] Orphan Asylums, Hospitals, &c. &c., have [illegible]. Make out for me a fair list of the prominent names of those [illegible] and the world are [illegible] and tell me how few [illegible] have been [illegible] educated in a reverent belief of the Bible, as God's word? Put down among them, Gerrit Smith, and tell me in what religion he was educated, and with what theology he commenced his labors? Tell me where he learned to "preach [illegible] from the Bible? Tell me why and how it is, that he still claims (as in his letter to William Goodell [illegible]) that [illegible] of the Bible, is that which he tries to make his own [illegible] —unless he makes it his rule of faith and practice [illegible] teacher of theology as well as of reform, since he identifies the one with the other? He says he tries with "poor success!" Has he found his success more rapid—his faith more firm, his hope more buoyant, his courage more undaunted, since he began to fancy he could find better guidance than that of the Bible, in the so called "Religion of Reason"? Or has he found all these years, to be "years of growing discouragement," till he is, at last, compelled to "work without hope"?

DOES THE BIBLE PREVENT UNITY IN RELIGION?

But I must check myself, and cut short my intended quotations. A mere reference to a few more passages must suffice.

On page 65, you tell us that

Were the nature religion, substituted for the book religion (i.e. the religion of the Bible,) [illegible] would be [illegible], that nearly all [illegible] men read nature substantially alike,"—that take away from the thousand Christian sects, their temptation to quarrel about a few words of the Bible,—by ceasing to regard it a book of authority, and their occupation would be gone."

What a remarkable statement! Who does not know that nearly all the *real, unforced* theological unity found in the world, has come from regarding the authority of the Bible as the supreme umpire? Who does not know that among "cultivated men," who recognize no such authority, anything like theological agreement is, for the most part, unheard of,—unthought of, unattempted,—seldom sought, or deemed desirable or possible. So far from finding two of them who approximate toward an agreement, except in negatives, who has not recognized the truthfulness of Pope's satire—and Pope was no orthodox bigot.—

"A smart free thinker, all things in an hour."

Pope knew, what all may know, that almost no man however "cultivated" who abjured the authority of the Bible, ever talked on theology or religion, for half an hour, without contradicting *himself*, to say nothing of his contradicting everybody else.

Who does not know that the general approximation toward theological union, in the evangelical or orthodox sects, in despite of their divisions on minor points of rituals and of church polity, is the world's marvel—often thrown in the teeth of the Orthodox, by the anti-Orthodox, in proof that they are all bound by a common authority, and do not reason for themselves? Who can fail to see that, unless this [illegible] taunt against the "Orthodox" is [illegible], your picture of their want of unity as compared with other people, [illegible]? For if the Evangelical or Orthodox differ from each other as much as do the anti-Orthodox, then the assumption that they think and reason less than other people is [illegible] by any fact. Either Gerrit Smith has made a great blunder here, or all *other* anti-Orthodox writers and speakers have—a want of unity between them to be noticed just here.

Who does not know that nine tenths of the theological bickerings and schisms of rival schools, *within* the sects, as well as *between* the sects, arise from undertaking to be "wise above what is written," and trying, by the help of mere [illegible] reason, to find out something that the word of God has never revealed, and which needs not to be known? Who does not know that a [illegible] class of plain, [illegible] experimental, practical, exemplary Christians, taking the Word of God, and the Spirit of God, for their teachers, will grow up together into a theological and [illegible] unity, never realized by any [illegible] of philosophers, theologians, or [illegible]?

Throwing away the authority of the Bible [illegible] What [illegible] of [illegible] ever [illegible] "Convention of [illegible]" compared with [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] were [illegible] who were agreed in [illegible] assailing [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] "[illegible]" and especially the [illegible] origin and authority of the Bible? Every shade of [illegible] of [illegible] and property [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] free [illegible] and no right of property at [illegible] every grade of theology, and [illegible] from the [illegible] atheism, to the [illegible] and worship of everybody and everything in general, and of "Mother Ann Lee," in particular—spiritualism and materialism—Henry C. Wrightism, versus Andrew Jackson Davisism, and vice versa,—the doctrine that man is his own supreme governor, his own independent arbiter—the doctrine that man is the product of a blind, undesigning fatality, controlled by organization of brain, incapable of self-direction or self-control—the doctrine that man is a brute, the doctrine that man is a God—the doctrine that human reason can discover the whole of religion, the doctrine that human reason can discover no religion at all,—the doctrine that man is born religious, the doctrine that man is incapable of religion—all these defended on grounds of all-sufficient human reason, and the longer they discussed, the more widely they drew apart, till [illegible] [illegible] which nothing was concluded, not daring to hazard a vote on one single proposition discussed!

Let the idea of the divine authority of the Bible as God's Word be obliterated from the civilized world, let Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson, be recognized as expounders of "the Religion of Nature and of Reason," and one century hence would see the knowledge and worship of the One only living and true God "supplanted" by Pantheism, which two centuries of "progress," more, would ripen into Polytheism—if like causes can produce like effects.—a unity in the worship of as many gods as are now worshipped in India. Such at least, would be the best, the only results that my own powers of reasoning could educe from their premises.

Does this seem to you extravagant? Let any competent person take pains to post himself up, in the metamaphysico-theological theories, that have divided the most "cultivated" minds of Europe, for a century past, and that still divide them—those of them, I mean, that do not believe in the divine authority of the Bible—and then let him say that the confusion of tongues, either at Babel, or in India, is not, at this hour, rivalled by them—the very men, who are recognized as the profoundest philosophers of Europe. And let him say whether, to the civilized world, they do not constitute what might well be designated the world's Rutland Convention, of the nineteenth century, in perpetual session! Among them, we might notice a Professor Agassis, at the head of his department of science, proclaiming to learned and applauding thousands, that God, if there be a God, has not made of one blood all the nations of the earth, so that the glittering generalities of our National Declaration of equal human rights, are based upon the "the logical fiction" of human brotherhood, derived from our "abominable book religion," that herein "contradicts nature." In proof that all "cultivated men read nature substantially alike," we might next put by the side of the Agassiz school, the disciples of Darwin, who are ready to demonstrate from "the nature religion," that not only all men, but all monkeys, toads, snakes and reptiles, are of "one blood," nay, that even vegetables constitute the parent stock, instead of Adam and Eve, from which all of us, in common with our brother beasts, have [illegible] another demonstration of the folly of seeking instruction from the degrading and "abominable book religion" that makes such a superstitious distinction between man the pretended heir of immortality, and the beasts that perish. To these, my dear Sir who hold yourself conclude that "a doctrine so important as another life should not be confidently received on any less certain testimony [illegible] [certainly not upon the authority of a book"] page 74 [illegible] the school of Darwin, I should think, would present powerful arguments, though perhaps few [illegible] [illegible] the spiritualists fail to furnish the [illegible] evidence that [illegible] live again." [illegible] Gerrit [illegible] the [illegible] "the Religion of Reason," [illegible] [illegible] And

in this case, it is not easy to see how, as many anti-slavery [illegible] they could [illegible] of the argument that [illegible] because of his [illegible] from the lower animals, who [illegible] The testimony of "the book [illegible]" to the [illegible] of man over the beasts, would have no [illegible] weight with them.

And finally [illegible] in this galaxy of [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] Emerson, [illegible] Theodore Parker, [illegible] of the "positive philosophy" [illegible] the [illegible] of whose [illegible] that unless man is the supreme Divinity, there is no God.

Such, my dear Sir is the matter of fact [illegible] part of your imaginary picture of the [illegible] of "the nature religion substituted for the book religion." Such is the end you [illegible] "nearly all cultivated men read nature substantially alike." Pardon me if I still prefer "the sure word of prophecy," [illegible] in a dark place. Excuse me, if I [illegible] the goodly fellowship of the apostles, the glorious company of the martyrs, "orthodox" though they be, for companionship with all these.

[illegible] OF REFORMERS—FURTHER [illegible] RELIGION.

Again I must check myself, and proceed with your "Religion of Reason," beginning where I left off.

"It is our duty to be reformers. [illegible] we make [illegible]"—p. 66.

You proceed, in illustration, to censure [illegible] "the Governments of Massachusetts, and New York," for not providing protection for fugitive slaves. And you start the question, "Why did they refuse to do it?" You might have answered, that it was because they did not reverence the word of God, which says, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant that hath escaped from his master unto thee," &c.—setting up, instead of that authority the authority of what they call *reason*, prudence, statesmanship, a just regard to the *consequences* of public measures. But instead of this, you exclaim

"Thus abominable, is a conventional book-religion. But to what beautiful contrast [illegible] stands the religion of nature! [illegible] Our slaveholding religion subjects a man to the [illegible] of a horse," &c., &c. p. 66.

Thus you make a slaveholding religion and a book religion, [*what* "Book?"] identical, and upon this abominable conventional "book" religion, you charge the refusal to "hide the outcasts," and "deliver the oppressed." Again

"We pass to other illustrations of the spuriousness of the prevailing religion. p. 67.

And here you specify the pro-slavery character and doings of "The American Tract Society," that refuses "to preach deliverance" to the slaves, and excuses the robbers who "carry on their robbery with the solemn air and long face of piety, as if it were a plainly commanded, and indispensable duty to Him who has said, I the Lord love judgement, I hate robbery for burnt offering." p. 67. Here you quote Scripture against slaveholders, and the Tract Society, and you quote it as having been "said" by "God." Did you not forget yourself a little, here? How do you thus prove that an abominable conventional "book religion" was responsible for [illegible] of the [illegible], and of the Tract Society?

[illegible]

"Another [illegible] illustration of the falseness of [illegible] current religion," you say, is afforded in the [illegible] sympathy with the [illegible] of Philip Barton Key, [illegible] because the religious press [illegible] [illegible]

"The defeat of [illegible] [illegible] in the current religion. p. 73.

[illegible] AND FUTURE EXISTENCE.

[illegible] page 74, you say that [illegible] the resurrection of the body [illegible] On page 56 you [illegible] [illegible] was [illegible] doctrine of the early Christians [illegible] the resurrection of the body [illegible] Paul's [illegible] to the contrary, when he said [illegible] their faith was vain.

[illegible] (p. 74), you [illegible] the question.

[illegible]

[illegible] p. 74.

You proceed to make a reasonable argument in favor of a future life, and then you say

[illegible] p.

You make no mention of the accumulated and accumulating revelations and facts of the Bible. You say nothing of the testimony of Jesus Christ—nothing of His argument against the Sadducees. Yet you seem to anticipate some future light "on a doctrine so important," from the revelations of modern spiritualism. Some Andrew Jackson Davis, his successor, if not himself, may determine "a doctrine so important" which Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world did not.

MIRACLES—ENLIGHTENED AND BROAD-MINDED MEN.

Again, you say

"To be frank, I suppose that all enlightened and broad-minded men, do at least doubt the truth of miracles." p. 60.

And so neither the Evangelists nor the Apostles, nor even Jesus himself, are to be classed among "enlightened and broad-minded men." It is sufficient for me to refer you to Mark IX. 39, where Jesus says "There is no man that shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me."

"FALSE LYING, IMPUDENT RELIGIONS."

"Hitherto religions altogether alien and revolting to human nature, have been forced upon it—religions whose slanderous song is,
'Nature must count her gold but dross
If she would gain this heavenly land.'
religions that have impudently and lyingly asserted their superiority to human nature, and that have thereby succeeded in bringing it under their tyrannical and crushing sway; religions that under the plea of saving human nature have gone about to kill it." p. 63.

There is no possibility of mistaking this. Nor is there any difficulty in determining, in the light of it, if not sufficiently determined previously, the meaning of what has already been quoted from your discourse, and which soon will be. It is the religion commonly denominated "orthodox" or "evangelical," of which you were speaking; not any perversions, or misapplications of it, not any want of belief in it, on the part of all, or any of its professors. It is the religion itself, its doctrines, its principles, that you were speaking against. The more earnestly they were believed, the more their spirit was imbibed, the more fully they were reduced to practice, the more you dreaded their influence. Thus you had before said.

With these views of "orthodoxy" you were prepared to tell, on the very next paragraph, on the very same page, what you thought of the orthodox. And you take pains to say, that you ascribe to their orthodox beliefs, their "base" and demoralized characters.

CHARACTER OF ORTHODOX COMMUNITIES.

Of those who were trained to believe in human depravity, you say

"Their degrading submission to the doctrine of total depravity, goes far toward accounting for their false morality, base spirit, and dwarfed manhood, &c., &c. Ib.

All respectable writers against "orthodoxy" heretofore, whether "liberal christians," so-called, Deistical, or Sceptical, have borne testimony to the distinguished purity of morals and uprightness of character, of communities trained in the orthodox faith, which includes this very doctrine, in which you, yourself Gerrit Smith, in this very connection, say "nearly all of us were trained to believe." It was the faith of the Protestant Reformers, of the Hugenots, of the Covenanters, of the Puritans, of Protestant Switzerland, of Scotland, of New-England—Hume, Bancroft and all historians testify to their elevated morality, their brave spirits, their enlarged manhood, their principles and spirit of freedom, precisely the [illegible] that you, Gerrit Smith, has here drawn. Sharp, Clarkson, Wilberforce, Wesley, Hopkins, Edwards and [illegible] of [illegible] of England and America, were [illegible] to believe this doctrine. The [illegible] of those who have [illegible] continued to believe. How could it be otherwise [illegible] consistently [illegible] truthful [illegible] both in the Church and in the State? How can Gerrit Smith help believe it [illegible]

describing it, and [illegible]! And yet you give us to understand that the cause of reform requires the belief in the doctrine to be "superseded" by a belief in the goodness of mankind, the goodness of human hearts, lives, habits, aims, aspirations, purposes, volitions and actions! Were this the fact, where radical reformation would be needed?

THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER.

Without stopping to quote further from this Discourse, I close with the following (which I [illegible] cited in my Review of your Syracuse letter,) [illegible] practical conclusion.

"Thus far [illegible] as far [illegible] the narrow limits [illegible] of nature. [illegible] Friends of Temperance, Friends of Peace, Friends of Freedom [illegible] the current religion has been superseded by [illegible] Nay, they are [illegible] with it. The [illegible]" p. 71.

RECAPITULATION.

Let us now gather up, as a way of recapitulation, the sum of the whole.

I. We see wherein your "Religion of Nature" or of "Reason" as distinguished from the "Orthodox" religion consists, according to your accounts of them.

II. We see that you regard them as radically opposed to each other, incapable of being harmonized, or of commingling with each other, or of being in fellowship with each other.

III. We see that, in your view, the existence of the Religion and the Theology of "Orthodoxy"—(for you, all along identify them together) is an insurmountable obstacle to reforms, and consequently that they must be "supplanted" by your Theology and Religion of Reason and of Nature, before there can be any extensive or permanent reforms.

IV. You make your appeal, accordingly, to the friends of Temperance, Peace and Freedom—*the friends of political reform*, and you bid them expect "no permanent or extensive success, until the current religion has been supplanted by the religion of nature."—Virtually, you conjure them to join with you, in that enterprize. You incidentally disclose to them the secret of your own "*growing despondency*," your faint hope of liberating the slave or of protecting the inebriate, by the ballot box, until this preliminary work of supplanting "the current religion of the Country" by your "Religion of Reason" is first effected.

In this, you do all you can—not to intentionally—inoculate the Friends of Temperance, Peace and Freedom, and of political reform, with the virus of your own despondency—that is,—in respect to accomplishing anything worth making much effort for, until this revolution in religion is first accomplished.

How perfectly this tallies with your late Letter to the Nominating Convention at Syracuse, in which you were nominated for the Presidency, I need not say. *To you* I need not point out the identity of the sentiment, in your Third Discourse on the Religion of Reason with the sentiment of the Letter to the Convention. You will not deny that identity, nor will your say that your object in the *one* was not your object in the *other*. In perfect harmony with the general scope and final appeal in that Discourse, you advised the Convention at Syracuse to do and expend little for *direct present political action* against the Rum Power, and the Slave Power, in the comparison with the labor and expenditure to revolutionize the Religion of the Country by "presses and Lecturers" to be employed for that purpose.

And that [illegible] is [illegible] be effected, merely, nor at all [illegible] the people *to live up to the religion they profess*, to the beliefs written out in their Church Creeds, [illegible] in the Bibles. [illegible] *belief* in [illegible] you have [illegible] in your "Third Discourse on the Religion of Reason" and which you say there [illegible] degrading, and enslaving, are to be [illegible] away. The [illegible] and [illegible] as the [illegible] book of books has [illegible] must be "superseded" by the Religion of Reason,—and the Book, as a book of authority as being the Word of God and as [illegible] must be cast aside. The study of the [illegible] of their Church Creed [illegible] the *same* study that has led [illegible] to take a bold stand against slavery, must [illegible] and impel them further forward! [illegible] "The Religion of Reason and Nature" [illegible] stand in [illegible]

Will you say that I have [illegible] your meaning, either in your Discourse or in your Letter to the Syracuse Convention? I think you will not?

And if not, I ask you whether I have [illegible] any [illegible] in my Review of your Letter to the Syracuse Convention? I ask you whether as a [illegible], truthful man, I could have said less, when knowing the facts of the case and retaining my belief in the "orthodox" religion—the "book religion" which you so strongly repudiate, and which you say the cause of Temperance, Peace, Freedom, and Political Reform requires to be "superseded" by your Religion of Reason?

And I ask you further, that you will candidly consider and reconsider the whole matter, and then say, upon your honor, and best judgment, whether you think it was just and right for you, in your Letter to me, concerning my Review, to throw either on *me* or upon "*orthodoxy*" the blame of a division of the Liberty party if it should be divided in consequence of my Review of your Syracuse Letter, and of your Discourses that preceeded it? Tell me, what "new demands of orthodoxy" I have set up—what "demand" old or new, but the demand that the nominating conventions of the Liberty party,—a political party the majority of whose members are "orthodox" shall not be occupied with proposals to employ "presses and Lecturers" to assist in "superseding" the Religion of "orthodoxy" by your "Religion of Reason?"—And tell me whether this was an unreasonable demand?

I do not forget that in your Syracuse Letter, you called the Religion you commended "the religion of Reason, common sense and Jesus Christ"—as distinguished from and opposed to "false religions" and "superstitions."—But I now ask you whether you did not, in the use of those phrases, mean by them, precisely what you meant by them, or their equivalents, in your Third Discourse on the Religion of Reason, June 19, 1859, from which I have been quoting?

So, also you may say, that by the phrases, "current religion"—"popular religion"—"prevailing religion," &c. in your "Discourse" from which I have been quoting, you meant a pro-slavery religion. But did you not *include and identify with* a pro-slavery religion what you likewise call a "book religion"—a "conventional religion"—an "artificial religion"—"*the popular or orthodox religion*" which you opposed, for its teaching the divine authority of the Bible, the atonement of Christ, the total depravity of mankind the "everlasting punishment," as Jesus Christ says (Matt. xxv) of those who "did not minister unto" him, in the persons of "the least" of his "brethren?"

You may, perhaps, say to me now, what you said to me in response to my Review *in the N. Y. Tribune*, in 1859, of your "Third Discourse"—when you said to me,

"I infer from your comparison of orthodoxy with the [illegible] Systems [illegible] that you confound and class [illegible] Unitarians. [illegible] for aught I see, Unitarians and Universalists are better than the Orthodox and are no less chargeable with [illegible] ling on human rights and [illegible] their backs on the [illegible] Christ. Unitarians and Universalists are as ready as the [illegible] to vote pro-slavery and rum tickets. [illegible] may be in their [illegible] nevertheless, what, as a whole, is a [illegible] religion worth, which [illegible] to keep [illegible] men [illegible] there may be valid, obligatory, real [illegible] for making slaves, and for voting for men who believe [illegible] of making drunkards? For many, many years I have [illegible] in the [illegible] throw away [illegible] heaven. [illegible]"

Should you again say this [illegible] I might reply [illegible] as I had no opportunity of doing, that [illegible] concerning those who [illegible] to which, in so large a measure, you ascribe the [illegible] ry and pro-rum [illegible] rule the country [illegible] proof positive, that all the [illegible] you have employed [illegible] "the religion of "orthodoxy" and its "Theology" are [illegible] by the fact that where that Theology [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] take [illegible] here, [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] you say not one word against their [illegible]. You rather insinuate, hint-wise, [illegible] creeds, as it is easy to see your [illegible] you [illegible].—You are at [illegible] the points at which they are at war with [illegible]. I never heard of your publicly [illegible] it in any way [illegible], but as a Temperance man, a Peace man, a friend of [illegible] a political reformer, a [illegible] Universalists, Unitarians, Swedenborgians, Shakers, or [illegible]. *Their* peculiarities you never treat with [illegible] or disrespect. It is only when you come to [illegible] or go out of your way to get at them the "orthodox" who for a quarter of a century have [illegible] the great majority of your fellow-laborers and supporters, at the ballot-box, and [illegible] where that you feel called upon of late years, to belabor them with your theological armory.—Can it be difficult to see *what kind* of "presses and lecturers" it is, that you commend to the support and patronage of the Liberty party, in preference to any great outlay for increasing votes against *Slavery* and *Rum*? You only call on the anti-orthodox sects to reduce their comparatively "sound" theology to practice. You call on the orthodox to throw away their theology, their "corrupt," "soul-withering," "soul-crushing" theology, as the only means of promoting a correct practice, either in themselves, or others?—Did you expect that your proposal to the Liberty Party, to sustain "presses and lecturers" in harmony with these views, would be unanimously approved, without remonstrance? If it produces division, are the "new demands of orthodoxy," to be held responsible for it?

You say Dr. Cheever's Church has not the true religion And you exclaim—"What a fact! William Goodell casting off his old fellow laborer, Gerrit Smith, and praising and numbering on the side of Freedom Dr. Cheever's pro-slavery voting Church!"—How do you know that that Church is a pro-slavery voting Church? Perhaps you have heard that its members voted for Fremont in 1856, when they must have seen, in all the Republican papers, Gerrit Smith's certificate to the anti-slavery sentiments and feelings of Fremont. Did you excommunicate Frederick Douglass from the anti-slavery Church for thus voting, under the same influence? I see he is nominated as one of the Presidential Electors to vote for you.—I never heard of your denouncing the Churches of Samuel J. May or of Dr. Chapin as Anti-Christian Churches because they voted pro-slavery—*some* of the members, perhaps voting for the Republican candidate, but, I presume, more of them doing even worse. If I could but see either of those Churches, or any other Churches of those denominations with their pastors taking the same stand, encountering the same opposition, and making the same sacrifices with Dr. Cheever's Church, most gladly would I bestow upon them every syllable of the "praise" I have given to the church of Dr. Cheever. And so would you. Yet, for that very limited praise, you think it a fitting occasion for you to exclaim—"Oh *Orthodoxy*, how bewildering and misleading is thy power!" What if I had thus exclaimed against you, and your Theology because, with William Jay's graphic account, before you, of the fillibustering zeal, strategy and [illegible] of Fremont, in the pro-slavery "Mexican War," as the [illegible] tool of Polk and Buchanan you [illegible] per- [illegible] and [illegible] a second time, in [illegible] my [illegible], and with stronger emphasis, to your friend Fremont, what he [illegible] the influence of your name, [illegible] perhaps [illegible] of anti-slavery votes [illegible] the cause of National [illegible]?

I have [illegible] your "Religion of Reason" Number [illegible], which [illegible] the following—

[illegible]

This will [illegible] before hand, [illegible] Williamsburgh and New York [illegible] ed in [illegible] to what they [illegible]? [illegible] you know [illegible] I [illegible] the church of [illegible] Treat. This [illegible] that is [illegible]. [illegible] I think [illegible] all the [illegible] for you in Williamsburgh and [illegible] all [illegible] orthodox. [illegible] for you in New-York. [illegible] a member of [illegible] a member of [illegible] Cheever's Church [illegible] efforts secured [illegible] New York [illegible] Cheever's Church [illegible] churches whose members sympathize with [illegible] in your castigations of [illegible] orthodoxy [illegible] there was probably not one [illegible] for you or for any other liquor prohibitionist [illegible]. I could tell a similar story of [illegible] orthodox" Church in the Country [illegible] with [illegible] little Church [illegible] most [illegible] of my acquaintance. It [illegible] throughout whole counties, situated in more than one or two States. I always make a long mark for every Universalist, Unitarian or Deistical vote for the Radical abolition ticket, especially since the Republican party has grown to be a large and popular party.

Yet you say what I have above quoted from you, about "the churches of William Goodell and George B. Cheever" to illustrate the proposition you had just been laying down, that "this religion of authority (meaning the religion that regards the Bible as authority—the "abominable book-religion,") accounts for the poor character of the great mass of church members"—that "the noble man you find there is the exceptional case" and that "while the true church of Christ is the school for producing the choicest specimens of humanity these sham churches of Christ are the manufactories the meanest."

This, it seems, you said, in July, before any "new demands of orthodoxy" had been set up at the Syracuse Convention, or afterward. This was your estimate of the "churches of William Goodell and George B. Cheever"—on the simple ground, so far as appears, that they held to what you call "the religion of authority."

But mistaken, uncharitable, and unfortunate, as was your illustration, drawn from "the churches of William Goodell and George B. Cheever" I am glad to see that, in some sort, you here *recognize* the propriety of distinguishing between different *kinds* of churches, and not binding them all up in one bundle for condemnation.—This justifies my objection against the sweeping language of your Letter to the Syracuse Convention. Were I a member of "the Church of Peterboro" I would just as earnestly protest against it as I now do. Quite too common, in some quarters, have been these indiscriminate condemnations of the churches. Anti-Slavery Churches, whether "orthodox" or otherwise, few as they are, and the more so, *because* they are comparatively few, cannot afford to be unrecognised and overlooked, and in effect, classified among pro-slavery churches, in this manner. Their influence is little enough, now. Their friends should not, by ignoring or disparaging them, reduce their influence to a cypher. The slave cannot afford it. Their statistics, on the other hand, should be carefully garnered up and published as their testimony. The historians of the church in their records, from the times of Novatian, have done [illegible], by putting down the exceptions to the main body as [illegible]. Whenever, if ever, an adequate and impartial history of Christianity shall be written, it will be found that the true church, since [illegible], has [illegible] friendly [illegible] necessary to [illegible] because, forsooth, they were the "exceptions." They were [illegible] few [illegible] as is commonly supposed.

The fourth Discourse of the "Religion of Reason" bears date July [illegible] this [illegible] your present views with your [illegible] in [illegible] and helping [illegible] further, to expound the meaning of your Letter to the Syracuse Convention.

[illegible] I [illegible] with your remarks [illegible] a book [illegible] your [illegible] as I [illegible] you would not withdraw religious fellowship [illegible] I [illegible] believe that a slaveholder [illegible] the true religion [illegible] you [illegible] Dr. Cheever's Church [illegible] you produce [illegible] Lawrence. You cry out, "Oh Orthodoxy, how bewildering and misleading is thy power!" because I [illegible] of that church. [illegible] might have something further to learn—while you yourself [illegible] that church [illegible] the American Missionary Association, are behind the Church Anti-Slavery Society, in withdrawing religious and Church fellowship from slaveholders. Whether [illegible] your theological [illegible] I leave for you to determine. You would not vote for a slaveholder for political office, but you would recognize him as a Christian and a Church member, making your political party purer than your Church. Excuse me if I think you might learn something—as I suppose Dr. Cheever's Church might—by studying the old fashioned [illegible] which you learned "Bible politics," and [illegible] Church Creed" where you learned the orthodox doctrine of Regeneration, which you have said, made you an [illegible] abolitionist. Let me conclude this too long Letter by adding that I do not wonder at your "growing despondency" if you think that the abolition cause cannot be carried forward without first "superseding" the foundation it stands upon, and upon which you, yourself stood in the beginning—"the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself, the chief corner stone." May you soon plant your feet there, again, and overcome your despondency.

I remain my dear Sir, with ever growing hopefulness, your "old friend and fellow laborer,"

WILLIAM GOODELL.

The Principia.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER [illegible]

☞ TICKETS.—Mr C. A. HAMMOND wishes us to say that *Election Tickets* may be had, by applying to him at Peterboro, Madison Co., N. Y.

THE EDITOR still craves the indulgence of his Readers and correspondents for any deficiences or remissness in his attentions, either to the preparation of the paper, or to their Communications and Letters. For nearly five weeks he has not been in his Office—has been mostly confined to his house, alternating the time between his bed and his writing table—and some of the time under medical treatment while a sense of duty has devolved an unusual amount of labor upon him. He hopes for a respite from *his present* topic of discussion, before long.

CORRESPONDENTS whose communications have not appeared, will please be patient. We always have on hand much more than we are able to print. We have some *stated* correspondents whom we cannot afford to spare, but even *their* articles must be delayed.

Several articles elicited by the late convention at Syracuse have been received, of which we hope to find room for one or two, in this paper—giving priority to those which *state facts*, bearing on our Review of the proceedings. We mean that those who differ from us shall have a fair hearing. But we wish them first to understand our positions correctly and the facts and arguments upon which they are founded. And while we are discussing the matter with GERRIT SMITH himself, we shall have to claim for him and for ourselves a monopoly of the argument and the space occupied by it.

[illegible]

FROM C. A. HAMMOND

Mr Goodell—You are mistaken in regard to the [illegible] of your Resolutions having been rejected by the Committee of the Abolition Convention. As a member of that Committee, I [illegible] that no word [illegible] of any sentiment in your resolutions was objected to [illegible] of the Committee. Indeed [illegible] Mr Gordon read [illegible] prepared, but the Committee [illegible] [illegible] their [illegible] [illegible] in the Principia the [illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible] C. A. HAMMOND.

[illegible] a difference of opinion [illegible]

NOTE.—[illegible] We [illegible]ve

[illegible] arrogance in [illegible] us to attend to [illegible]. It has been [illegible] Moderator [illegible] lk on that [illegible] if the preset [illegible] we should not have [illegible] they had we not been requested [illegible] who [illegible] was Chairman of the Committee [illegible] the Convention. We said, in our Review, that we made no complaint on account of [illegible] and supposed that there were good reasons for it.

[illegible] So we suppose[illegible]. This is what we intended to [illegible] the whole of it. It is probable that [illegible]dy saw the Resolutions, if Mr. Hammond did not.

A CHEEVER CASE IN WILLIAMSBURGH.

[illegible] our News Department [illegible] we copied an article from the Brooklyn Daily Times, containing the proceedings of an Ecclesiastical body in the Protestant Methodist Church meeting in the removal of the Rev. Mr. Bell from his pastoral charge in Williamsburgh. This Bro. Bell is well known here, and to other abolitionists, in Williamsburgh, as an interesting preacher and an earnest advocate of the oppressed. We have entire confidence in him and in his statements. For some time past, the Brooklyn and New York papers have been publishing fragmentary, [illegible]ded, and injurious accounts of the difficulties between Mr. Bell and portions of the two churches under his ministry. The report in the *Times* betrays, certainly, no partiality in his favor. But with the reported statements of Mr. Bell the reader cannot have failed to learn the true merits of the case. As in the case of Dr. Cheever, the preacher gave good satisfaction till he preached against slavery. Then he became suddenly unpopular, and his support was cut off. And when the case comes before the Church, and is to go before the public, it is not because the pastor had preached against slavery. Oh! No! It is only because the pastor or his friends, or both of them, took measures to keep his family from starving! In Dr. Cheever's case, the fault was going *outside* of the Church for support. In Mr. Bell's case, it was his appealing *to* the Church, to fulfil its engagements. So, in Mr. Bell's case, it is ecclesiastically decided that he must quit, with a clerical certificate of good christian character, and ministerial standing, in his pocket, to go wherever else he may, and have the same game played over again, if he ventures a repetition of his imprudence. Just as the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, the *Independent*, &c. would like to see done in the case of Dr. Cheever. In both cases, hints were given that the pastor had better withdraw. In both cases, the proposals were very properly declined, and the responsibility thrown on the Churches.

We commend the study of this case, especially, to our *Wesleyan* brethren, who have been deliberating upon an Ecclesiastical Union with the *Protestant Methodists*. (The last N. Y. Wesleyan Conference was held in one of the very churches that has now rejected Bro. Bell.) We hope the *Wesleyans* will look twice before they take a leap in *that* direction.

This case too, deserves attention, as being but a fair average specimen of the removal of *hundreds* of faithful ministers from their pulpits, for no fault but preaching against slavery in this country. We wish somebody would collect the history of them, and publish them in a series of volumes, for it would require several. This would serve to correct the mistake that only a few ministers, (most, or all of them, of the evangelical or orthodox sects,) have been driven from their pulpits for their faithful testimony against slavery. It would at the same time silence the pretense of the *Independent*, on the other hand, that most, or all, or a large majority of the clergy are antislavery. These *two mistakes* are particularly mischievous, at this time. The one inflames the cry that orthodoxy and evangelism are essentially pro-slavery, the exceptions not being worth noticing—the other, that *all* the ministers, nearly, being anti-slavery, the *persecuted* ones were persecuted for their own fault, or on other grounds than their anti-slavery preaching.

From Bro. Bell we learn a few additional particulars. The Superintendent of the Williamsburgh station, during the troubles, was a Dr. Bulger, from Louisiana, whose wife had been a slaveholder, and he had sold her slaves. Before the superintendency of Dr. Bulger, Mr. Bell had met with little if any opposition. Under his superintendency, the opposition became violent. On one occasion, Dr. Bulger was so excited as to shake his fist in the face of Mr. Bell. Whether from an apprehension of censure on this account, or from some other cause, Dr. Bulger has resigned the superintendency. During the [illegible] charges of [illegible] preaching [illegible] and [illegible] were [illegible] against Mr. Bell. But what [illegible] the matter [illegible] the [illegible] it was [illegible] sary? In fact, there was [illegible] anything [illegible] only it was [illegible].

Bro. Bell, by the [illegible] belongs to the Wes[illegible] though he was ministering to the two Protestant Methodist Churches. We trust he will not find it difficult to obtain a field where his labors will be acceptable. We heartily commend him to the friends of pure and undefiled religion, wherever he may go. He is yet a young man. May he long live and labor as a good soldier, having borne the yoke in his youth.

For the Principia.

FROM W. W. CHAPMAN.

Rev. Goodell:—The *Principia* of Sept. 15th came to hand too late in the week, for me to answer or explain in regard to the doings of the last Convention of Radical Abolitionists held at Syracuse, in your next issue. Your review of its proceedings, and Mr. Smith's letter, I have examined, and wish to notice that portion of which I do not approve. 1st. Mr. Smith's letter was read before the Convention with others, and many were omitted for want of time. It was not sanctioned by vote, or otherwise; and if his theory of the "religion of reason" is in the letter, it was not discovered, nor endorsed by the meeting. It was our intention to commend no other religion than the "pure and undefiled," that visits the widow and the fatherless in their afflictions, &c. But it *was* our design to strike down that pro-slavery Faith that fills so many churches in this land with political infidelity—that overlooks the iniquity of thousands of their members, who intend to vote for Lincoln or Douglas at the coming election; and who are catching at every shadow of support in a pro-slavery divinity, and exceptionable portions of radical documents, even, to sustain them. The doctrines contained in the "three discourses on the religion of Reason," can in no wise be attached to the Platform of the Liberty Party. Mr. C. A. Hammond reported the series of resolutions to the Convention which were adopted: whether he is a convert to Mr. Smith's theories, I know not. Mr. Putnam presented others at the evening session after many had left, which were also received. Wm. Goodell and R. W. Lyman, and other radicals, sent in resolutions of an approved stamp. There might have been some improprieties in the business department, as everything was done in a short space of time. But I saw no diverting, or letting down of our principles, from their healthful channels. The despondency, of which you speak, in Mr. Smith's letter, I thought ill timed, but it did not damp the ardor of any one present, but all were inspired with great zeal and confidence in the the principles of our expedition. Many of your remarks and suggestions will do great good; though some of them I deemed rather severe upon those who acted in the Convention, and a forestalled rebuke upon Mr. Smith in his present position. His Cuba doctrine, his compensated emancipation creed, &c. to which you allude, are small items of his individuality indeed. And, as *he* holds and defines them, can never mar the great doctrines of immediate and unconditional emancipation, of the Radical Abolitionists. W. W. Chapman.

Mi[illegible], Sept. 17, 1860.

From the Syracuse [illegible].

Church Anti-Slavery Society—Meeting at Plymouth Church.

On Monday evening Rev. Henery T. Cheever, of Jewett City, Ct. addressed a meeting at the Plymouth Church, of this city, in behalf of the organization know as the Church Anti-Slavery Society. He presented at length a plea for such an Association in the bosom of the church, showing the necessity of it, not as superseding other Anti-Slavery Societies, but as the protest of christianity through its legitimate channel (the church) against the unchristian practice of slaveholding.

At the close of his address, Mr. Cheever submitted the following resolutions, which were ably supported by Rev. Mr. Betkar, of the Wesleyan Church, and then adopted by the meeting.

A collection was also taken in behalf of the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

Rev. Mr. Striebe of the Plymouth Church presided.

The resolutions adopted are as follows:

Resolved, That in the judgment of this meeting, the change of [illegible] and [illegible] which has taken place in the tone upon the subject of Slavery [illegible] apostacy from the faith of our Fathers, and from the principles and precepts of the Bible, makes it [illegible] Northern Christians to remonstrate with their Southern professors of christianity who uphold and practice slavery, and to refuse them the ordinary terms of christian fellowship, as a scriptural and necessary rebuke for their [illegible] and practice of a sin hateful to God and abhorrent from christianity.

Resolved, That as the sin of slavery consists in the theory and act of slave-holding, it is for Christians and churches to say distinctly to the slaveholder, Thou art the man, and to treat him as one whose practice [illegible] his destitution of christianity.

Resolved, That [illegible] view the time has fully come for Northern churches and ministers to take position and declare themselves upon the question of christian abolitionism, that is, the duty of abolishing slavery in the name of Christ; and that we should henceforth willingly welcome the charge and bear the cross of being called abolitionists.

News of the Day.

Episcopal Diocesan Convention—African Slave Trade.

The N. Y. *Tribune*, Sept. 28, contains an account of the proceedings of the Diocesan Convention just held in New York, from which we extract the following:

SECOND DAY—EVENING SESSION.

After the transaction of some routine business, Mr. John Jay arose, and proceeded to speak upon the subject of the foreign slave-trade, by way of preface to certain resolutions which he designed to present to the Convention. He was violently opposed by certain members of the Convention, but the Bishop ruled that he was in order, and he proceeded in spite of the evident uneasiness of many of the delegates.

We are sorry to omit the able speech of Mr. Jay, which occupies three and a half columns of *The Tribune*.—At the close of his Speech, Mr. Jay offered the following Resolution:

Whereas, The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States have, through their Board of Foreign Missions, established various missions on the coast of Africa, and this Convention feels a strong interest in the success of the said Missions as the means for the conversion of Africa to the principles and practices of Christianity. And *whereas*, it has been made to appear to this Convention that a class of persons residing in the diocese of New-York are engaged in sending vessels to the Western Coast of Africa, with the view of kidnapping and seducing to Slavery large numbers of the said people; and it is publicly pretended and asserted that the doctrine of Christianity justifies and approves of the enslaving of men, women and children, and reducing them to the condition of chattles; and there is good reason to believe that the said trade will interfere materially with the said Mission, and that a belief on the part of the Africans that those who engage in the African slave-trade are Christians, may indispose the Africans so believing to embrace Christianity, and lead them to reject with scorn and indignation the teaching of our missionaries. Threfore

Resolved, That this Convention in order to prevent all misapprehension in regard to the position of the Church in this Diocese on the subject of the slave-trade, do hereby declare and announce that the Convention do utterly reject the doctrine that men may be lawfully kidnapped and held in Slavery by any other person, and do utterly condemn the said practice as a great sin against God and man. And do adopt, in regard thereto the words of St. Cyprian in writing to the Bishop of Numidia, "Both religion and humanity make it a duty for us to work for the deliverance of the captive. * * It is Jesus Christ, himself, of whom we ought to consider in our captive brother. It is Him whom we should deliver from captivity—Him who hath delivered us from death."

Mr. Jay was frequently interrupted in the delivery of his remarks, by the discussion of points of order, which the Bishop decided in Mr. Jay's favor, at the same time appealing to the Convention to maintain silence, as well as by the disorderly behavior of a number of members who left the house with such noise and confusion, as for some minutes to interrupt the quiet of the convention.

These interruptions continued until a late hour, compelling some abridgements of the speech in its delivery. The concluding, [illegible] discussion was had by several gentlemen including the Rev. Dr. Vinton who appealed to Mr. Jay to withdraw his resolutions. This Mr. Jay [illegible] to do.

The Rev. Mr. [illegible] then moved that they be laid on the table, and the vote by orders being called for, the vote stood

Clergy—Yeas,	[illegible]4	Laity—Yeas	[illegible]
Nays	[illegible]	Nays	[illegible]

Whereupon the Convention adjourned.

THIRD DAY.

Mr. J. [illegible] of [illegible] said he had a resolution which he wished to offer without debating the [illegible] by any further [illegible] remarks [illegible]

[illegible] was in the pamphlet. He proceeded to read as follows: "Whereas, The [illegible] of the late [illegible] of this Diocese [illegible] refer a [illegible] preamble [illegible] "the duty [illegible] prohibiting the [illegible] of the African slave trade from the port of New-York within the limits and jurisdiction of [illegible]," has excited much remark at home and abroad. The London Christian Observer has remarked thereon in these words:

"Even the Episcopal Convention, there is [illegible] not merely to justify [illegible] stealers, but to add the weight of its authority to their [illegible] cause.

And Whereas, Such an interpretation of the action of the [illegible] Convention, from so respectable a source, is calculated, if uncontradicted by this body, and simply taking reproach and odium on the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and to give [illegible] to immorality and infidelity, [illegible] strength to the African slave-trade, as prosecuted from the port of New-York, and embolden the [illegible] thereof to defy the laws of their country and of God, and to prosecute with impunity the [illegible] trade in their fellow creatures: Therefore,

Resolved, That this Convention, for the purpose of preventing all such misapprehension and evil consequence, do hereby unanimously declare that, so far from approving or tolerating the said trade, or regarding it as one that may be innocently prosecuted under any circumstances whatsoever, do reprobate and condemn the buying and selling of human beings, or the holding of them in Slavery after they have been so bought and sold, as contrary to the doctrines of the Church and to the Word of God, and as constituting a very fearful and wicked crime. And this Convention doth call upon all members of the Church in this diocese, by the authority of the Church and in the name of God to set their faces against all traffic in human beings—to remember that the victims of said trade, and all human beings whatsoever, are equally with themselves, the children of Our Father in Heaven, and that if they fail to do unto these, their brethren, as they would be done by and continue to make merchandise of the sons of God, they may justly fear his wrath, which of old he visited on those who, in the words of Scripture, dealt in "slaves and the sons of men."

Mr. Silkman had not proceeded far when he was called to order by Mr. Weaver of Fordham. Mr. Weaver said this was not the place and time to legislate upon slavery; it was their duty to consider matters of the Church.

A delegate from his left also called Mr. Silkman to order, and the ground was that this subject had been considered and already acted upon by the present Convention, and that by one of the resolutions of order it could not be reproduced.

Mr. Silkman was about proceeding with the reading, but Mr. Weaver insisted on his point of order. Calls of "order" came from nearly all parts of the Church. The Chair (temporarily occupied by Dr. Creighton) was undecided and hesitated, during which Mr. Silkman again read on, but was in consequence of repeated calls for order and confusion, interrupted by the Chair. The Chairman still hesitated, and said he was not prepared to say Mr. Silkman was out of order. Dr. Vinton's point of order, which was quite energetically stated, represented that it was not necessary, in offering a resolution, to read what *The London Christian Observer* had said or written.

The Chair had decided Mr. Silkman to be in order. Mr. Eigenbrodt appealed from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Silkman hoped the gentlemen would hear the resolutions read before voting as to its merits.

A vote was taken, and the majority seemed to go with the Chair, in favor of allowing the resolution to be read.

Mr. Silkman presuming that the chair had pronounced in his favor as to the majority, again resumed the reading of the resolution.

A division was called for, but the Chairman requested the vote to be repeated, which was done. Division was again called for. The Chairman however, decided that he was not sustained, and Mr. Silkman was therefore compelled to sit down.

A division on the last vote was now called for by several gentlemen of the other side, while some saying "adjourn [illegible]," and others saying, "the subject will then come up again," [illegible] adjourn sine die, [illegible]

Dr. Vinton at the same time (Bishop Potter here took the chair) moved that the Convention adjourn sine die after the reading of the [illegible] and the usual religious exercises.

This motion was [illegible] by [illegible] and carried by a large majority.

Mr. Silkman said he would [illegible] a reconsideration of this vote for the purpose of—

Dr. Vinton [illegible] Mr. S. said [illegible] in the affirmative? Mr. S. replied he [illegible]. The [illegible] reconsider was seconded by several persons, but was lost.

After attending to some [illegible] matters the Convention adjourned sine die.

IMPORTANT FROM EUROPE

The North American arrived at Quebec [illegible] news of the [illegible] organization of the Papal army under [illegible] Lamoricière. Victor Emanuel is, indeed, King of Italy. The Pope, it is said, is preparing for flight. If he [illegible], it is believed that the French troops will leave [illegible] and [illegible] to the Sardinians. Austria is making [illegible] A [illegible] to the King [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] De [illegible]. This will [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible]

The Objects of Mr Lindsay's Mission to the United States.

From the London Shipping Gazette, Sept. 7.

To-morrow Mr. W. S. Lindsay sails from Liverpool for the United States on the [illegible] which, a fortnight since, we were enabled to announce as definitely resolved upon. Since that announcement appeared in our columns, our contemporaries, of all shades of politics, have deemed it necessary to refer to it in the language of doubt or disparagement, [illegible] of them have ventured to deny its truth. We have now only to say that our statement respecting the [illegible] of Mr. Lindsay's mission was correct in every particular. He goes to Washington at the instance of Her Majesty's Government. He is furnished by the Government with documents which place him in possession of all that has been hitherto done by the Foreign-office in the way of correspondence or negotiation with the American Government; and Lord Lyons has received express instructions to afford Mr. Lindsay every possible facility in placing his views fairly before the Cabinet of Washington. In short, Mr. Lindsay, except that he does not hold the Queen's Commission as Special Envoy, possesses all the authority as a negotiator on maritime affairs, with which it is possible for the advisers of the Crown to invest him, while the mission on which he is about to proceed is one of paramount importance to the carrying trade of this country. It will be seen, therefore, that while there is no intention to supersede Lord Lyons, or in any way to interfere with the diplomatic functions of our Minister at Washington, it has been considered advisable by our Government, seeing that adequate information on the subject of our maritime relations with the United States has not been hitherto effectually conveyed through the ordinary channels of diplomacy, to select some person whose practical acquaintance with maritime commerce would make him a successful interpreter of their views as well as of those of the United States Government, and the choice of the Government, no doubt directed by the events of the past session, has rested upon Mr. Lindsay. It is not the first time in the history of the commercial relations of this country with foreign States that persons possessing the confidence and acting with the authority of the British Government, have been employed for the purpose of adjusting commercial questions which proved to be beyond the sphere or the powers of diplomacy to adjust. Towards the close of the last century, Mr. Eden was employed by Mr. Pitt on a mission which proved unsuccessful only because the time was unpropitious. Our reciprocity treaties with Prussia, with France, with Denmark, and with the Hanse Towns, bear the signature of William Huskisson. The Maine boundary questions, which defied all the efforts of diplomacy, and threatened for a long time to involve us in hostilities with the United States, were at length settled by Alexander Baring, a successful merchant, specially accredited to Washington for the purpose, and settled with an ease and rapidity which astonished the diplomatic world. A commercial treaty has been recently concluded with France, the effect of which time must reveal. The negotiation was intrusted to Mr. Cobden, because our Government well knew that it involved details, with which the able Minister, who represents this country in Paris had but a slender acquaintance. *Prima facie*, therefore, the selection of Mr. Lindsay as the negotiator of a question involving commercial details is agreeable to precedent, and entirely justifiable on the part of the Government, and ought to be successful. It seems to be in accordance with the simple rule of common sense, by which a man's fitness for a certain work determines his selection. It is no reflection upon the ability or discretion of Lord Lyons that he is not as intimately acquainted with the details of the maritime relations of this country with the United States, as a man who has been for years directly interested in the British Carrying Trade, and who has made the subject of Maritime Commerce in all its bearings his peculiar study; nor can we conceive it any degradation to Lord Lyons that he has been instructed to confer with Mr. Lindsay, and to become the official medium of laying that gentleman's views and the result of his practical experience fully before the American Government. And whatever may be thought of the great results of diplomatic action in international affairs, there is [illegible] by any private and unofficial intercourse of a few authorised individuals, acting on the part of their respective Government, than the world at large would believe. Some of the most important arrangements between Governments have been settled in the most unpretending fashion, and [illegible] consent of the Government and the exchange of ratifications [illegible] nothing [illegible] upon a foregone conclusion. And this is [illegible] especially true of Commercial Treaties.

Mr. Lindsay goes to Washington for the purpose of asking the [illegible] of the American Government [illegible] proposals which the British Government [illegible] to place the Maritime [illegible] more just and [illegible]. He will [illegible] injustice [illegible] on the British [illegible] by the refusal of the United States to [illegible] Coasting Trade to British Shipping, seeing that every branch of the British Carrying Trade [illegible] Coasting, and [illegible] American Shipping. He can show that a persistence in such a policy is opposed to the extension of American Commerce and [illegible] inflict any injury on the American Mercantile Marine, on the contrary, that the increased carrying which would [illegible] would be more than an equivalent for the loss in freights which would probably attend the opening of the trade. He may urge that the spirit of liberality which [illegible] the Commercial legislation of this country is [illegible] in the recommendation of the recent Parliamentary Committee, which, if adopted—as they undoubtedly will be—will relieve American shipping frequenting these ports to the extent of £[illegible] per annum paid as Light Dues. In discussing the great international question of belligerent rights at sea, Mr. Lindsay may point to the admission made by the States who are parties to the Declaration of Paris, and to the impossibility of England maintaining the position in which she is placed by that declaration, except respect for private property at sea in war time is made the rule amongst maritime States. This must be, or England must revert to her ancient maritime rights. The necessity which exists for a uniform law in respect to collision between American and British ships, whether in British or American waters, or on the high seas, has long been admitted, and demands the earnest attention of those who desire to see the maritime relations of the two countries placed on a settled and satisfactory footing. There are other matters, such as the extradition of those charged with atrocities on board ship, which should also find a place in the approaching deliberations. These questions, it will be admitted, for their successful treatment, demand several a practical acquaintance with the working of the evils they involve. Mr. Lindsay has an arduous but an honorable task to perform, and if he proves himself equal to it, and succeeds in his mission, he will deserve to rank with those who have conferred a lasting service on their country. It will be no discredit to him across the Atlantic that he is a "self-raised and self-educated man." The sneer will not count for much, we may rest assured, in the United States. We have only to congratulate the shipping interest at large that a practical man has been selected to deal with questions which so deeply concern them, and to wish him every success which his mission, directed as it is to the attainment of so important an object, deserves. We may perhaps, regret that Mr. Lindsay's departure on the mission he has undertaken should provoke hostile criticism in any direction, because it seems to us to be well conceived and directed to an honest purpose; but, having said thus much, we are content to abide the issue.

REMARK. It strikes us that men capable of transacting the necessary business, in a common-sense way, should be selected as *Ministers*, in the first place, or else the expensive pageant of Ministers Plenipotentiary should be abolished altogether.—We remember, by the bye, an instance similar to the above, in which *Gerrit Smith*, without any appointment for the purpose, negociated the Reciprocity Treaty with Canada.—*Principia*.

CAPTURE OF THE SLAVER STORM KING.

Special Dispatch of the N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 28, 1860.

THE CAPTURE OF THE STORM KING.

Captain Dorin, Commanding United States ship San Jacinto, reports that on the [illegible]th of August last, while proceeding from Monrovia to Loando, he fell in with and captured a hermaphrodite brig, without name, having on board a cargo of 619 Africans. Of these 160 were men, 130 women, 261 boys, and 68 girls. According to a statement of John Leckhard, a passenger on board, it appears that the vessel is the celebrated Storm King, which brought the two United States Deputy Marshals into so much difficulty last May at New York. She left that city under his command, and was subsequently sold to a Spanish captain. She left the African coast about the 6th of August. Captain Dorin directed Lieut. A. K. Hughes to take charge of the prize and proceed to Monrovia, where he would transfer the Africans to the Rev. John Leys, Agent of the United States for recaptured Africans by our cruisers. After landing the Africans, he was instructed to proceed to Norfolk and turn the prize vessel over to the United States authorities. Three negroes died before reaching Monrovia.

Lieut. Hughes reports that while [illegible] the Africans at Monrovia, the ship Erie, commanded by Lieut. Dunnington, with upward of 8[illegible] Africans on board, which were captured on the [illegible] of August by the United States steamer Mohican, Commander Gordon, entered the harbor.

GEN. WALKER SHOT,

NEW-ORLEANS, Friday, Sept. 28, 1860.

The British war steamer Gladiator had been quarantined [illegible] the remnant of Gen. Walker's army.

Walker was shot on the 12th inst. The shots were fired at [illegible]. He was afterward [illegible], no native [illegible] to take any part in the ceremony. Col. Rudler has been sentenced to four years imprisonment.

Family Miscellany.

A LYRICAL GEM

The [illegible] tender [illegible] to make every [illegible] for a baby [illegible]

Come to me [illegible]!
Let me ga[illegible] to myself
Bury [illegible] hair
And [illegible] you wear.
Fr[illegible] tw[illegible]k[illegible]
De[illegible] g[illegible]w[illegible]
Cl[illegible] m and [illegible]
A[illegible]g [illegible] a part
C[illegible] a [illegible] t[illegible] r[illegible]rm
[illegible] and sweet [illegible]

Sleep, baby [illegible]
The little [illegible]t,
[illegible] and soft
[illegible]
[illegible] are safe
In [illegible] shepherd's warm f[illegible]
[illegible] asleep
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] the baby's dream
[illegible]
On the lap of the stream
And holy and calm,
[illegible] motherly [illegible]
The stars look down
From the silent skies.

Sleep, baby boy
My birdling, my flower,
My lily, my lambkin,
My dewdrop, my dower.
While heart against heart
Beats softly in time,
To the murmuring flow
Of my tender old rhyme.

FOR THE CHILDREN.

We had an address at our Sabbath School a few Sundays ago, which made little bright eyes shine, and which will doubtless remain in little heads for a long time to come. I thought how all the children who see the *Principia* would love to have heard it, but as that could not be, I will try to tell them something about it. I will endeavor to use the speaker's own language, though I very much fear that, distilled through my brain, it will loose much of the freshness and piqnancy which made it so entertaining. The subject was,

THE SPIDER'S SERMON.

Children, did you ever hear a *spider* preach? You have often heard *men* preach, but do you not know that animals, and birds, and insects, and flowers and trees preach; and a great many things preach that cannot speak? I went to hear a spider preach one Sunday morning. I have a shed, back of my house, where I keep wood, and tools, and various things to work with; and I went there that morning to *think*. It is of great importance in this world sometimes to stop and *think*. People often do wrong things, just because they don't think. When you have done anything you ought not to have done, don't you always say "Oh, I didn't think." You *must think*.

Well, as I told you, I went out to my shed, and sat down on a board to think. Pretty soon, I happened to look up to the little window, way up in one corner, and there I saw a great spider, very busily at work. He was making his web. You have all seen a spider's web. You know how beautiful it is, with its fine delicate threads woven together so ingeniously. We couldn't make one if we should try all day. But the spider knew how. He took a point and spun a thread over to another [illegible], then he spun another thread across it, and another, and [illegible], and then he began in the center, and spun [illegible] around and around, catching them up with his [illegible], (and that is why a spider has so many legs,) and fastening them [illegible], very quickly; and so he worked away industriously till his web was finished. Then he went back to his house—for he had quite an elegant mansion, a little way off—to rest and wait for [illegible] to come along. By and by a little fly started out for a morning walk. He was a young fly, and like many young folks, thought he knew all about everything, and didn't need any of father's or mother's advice—[illegible]! [illegible] there a beautiful, bright window, with the [illegible] streaming in, and so many pretty things shining all around! What grand times he would have, to be sure! So he walked on very confidently till he reached the spider's web, and there he got one foot stuck fast. He tried to pull it out, but only succeeded in getting farther in. He buzzed and fluttered, but all in vain. The old spider peeped out of his door, and, seeing what was to pay, came down, and spun a thread across the wings of the poor foolish fly, and [illegible] him [illegible] very tightly, so that he [illegible] get away. The spider was [illegible] hungry now, [illegible] young prisoner and [illegible] what a [illegible] and [illegible]s [illegible] them.

In the afternoon, I thought I would go and see what had become of [illegible] fly. I found that he had been killed, and partly eaten by the spider; and there, too, were the bodies of as many as half a dozen poor silly young flies, all hung up in front of the spider's house.

Now, there are a great many different kinds of spiders, children. There are some spiders in this city, who have their webs all spun, and will try and entice you to walk into them, and be caught, like that poor little fly. Now I want you to look out for these spider's webs, and not get your foot into one of them. Many of them are built very handsomely, and look very attractive, and over the top of them say, "*Porter-house*," or "*Choice Wines, &c*," and some of them contain a kind of poisonous weed, curiously rolled up, one end of which is to be lighted, and the other end put into a person's mouth. Children look out for these spider's webs!

An energetic and decidedly sensible young maiden starts the following. We clip from a western exchange:

THE GIRLS DEFINING THEIR POSITION.

PLATFORM—NO TOBACCO OR NO HUSBAND.

"Girls, why not get up an Anti-Tobacco Society? You form Temperance Clubs, and publish your intentions not to marry young men who indulge in the "social glass," and are down, in toto, on the unfortunate chap who soils his lips with touch of the wine-cup. How is it about tobacco? How does it look stuffing in a black, nauseous, poisonous weed and rolling it as a choice morsel in his teeth, or going about with a roll of it depending from his lips?

"I'll tell you what it is, girls, I won't marry a man who uses Tobacco! I am not going to have a spittoon standing in the middle of every floor, for myself my children and friends to stumble over, nor have my stoves bespattered with tobacco-juice! Do you suppose I would do as Mrs. Neff and lots of ladies I know of—clean after tobacco-spit? I care not how immaculate his broadcloth, or how unincumbered his estates, or how supremely graceful or self possessed, &c., &c.—the moment I see him hang around a spittoon, as a moth hovers near a candle, I am ready to say 'good by' to him; for neither myself nor servants shall ever be degraded into the task of taking care of his needless, inexcusable, unpardonable filth. * * *

It is bad enough, everywhere I go,—especially in the railroad cars,—to be compelled to wipe the pools and quids with my dress, and be spit upon without ceremony.—When I have a house of my own, it shall be too sacred and decent for such abominations!

"So, now girls, what do you say?—Here's my flag!—how many will enroll under my banner? Come, enlist!"

A responsive throb is felt in the hearts of *some* young ladies of the vicinity of New York. We extend the right hand of fellowship to our western sister, and with hearty good will subscribe to

THE LADIES' ANTI-TOBACCO PLEDGE.—We, the subscribers, believing the use of tobacco, whether in the form of smoking, snuffing or chewing to be uncleanly, unhealthy and expensive hereby pledge ourselves never to marry any man who is addicted thereunto. L——.

THE PLANET VULCAN.

European astronomers are still busily occupied in discussing and verifying Dr. Lescarbault's discovery of an intra-Mercurial planet. Since the commencement of the present year, nearly a [illegible] eminent men have written [illegible] among whom are [illegible] names [illegible] Radau [illegible] Faye and Carrington.

[illegible] and [illegible] by his [illegible] those infinite [illegible] beyond the orbit of Herschel, Leverrier [illegible] ed his attention to the innermost circle [illegible] our solar system. By theoretical [illegible] irregularities in the movement of Mercury [illegible] the existence of some planet or planets lying [illegible] within the light and heat of the sun. While proceeding with his [illegible], he received a letter from Lescarbault, [illegible] a poor doctor of Orgeres, a village in the department of [illegible] and Loire in France, who had actually discovered an intra-Mercurial [illegible] making its transit, in appearance like a small black spot, across the [illegible] the [illegible].

ANGELS IN THE HOUSE.

[illegible]

I [illegible] The [illegible] e w[illegible] He [illegible] ve[illegible] The [illegible] girl [illegible] years [illegible]

[illegible] he [illegible] "Perhaps some people would think [illegible] for [illegible]k. I have [illegible] the [illegible], and of [illegible] night [illegible] I have [illegible] it has a [illegible] influence on the children, and because I [illegible] it may have had a good influence on myself. Last night I went to Lodge [illegible] is a M[illegible] and did not get [illegible] after 11 o'clock. The children, of course, were all [illegible], and I supposed asleep. Before going to bed I knelt down by my bed to pray, and had been there but a moment when I heard Nellie get up from her [illegible] in the next room and her little feet come pattering across the floor toward [illegible]. I kept perfectly still and she came and knelt down beside me without saying a word. I did not notice her and in a moment, speaking just above her breath, she said, '*Pa, pray loud*.' I prayed. I kissed her and she went back to bed; and I tell you, G——, I have had nothing affect me so for the last ten years. I have thought of nothing else all day long, but just that little—'*Pa, pray loud*.'"

YOUNG AMERICA WONDERS.—Wonder why mamma keeps Bridget at home from church to work all day, and says it is wicked for me to build my rabbit-house on Sunday?

Wonder why our minister bought that pretty cane with the yellow lion's head on the top, and then asked me for my cent to put in the missionary box? Don't I want a jewsharp just as much as he wants a cane?

Wonder what makes pa tell such nice stories to visitors about his hiding the master's ratan, when he went to school and about running away from the schoolmaster when he was going to whip him, and then shuts me up all day in a dark room, because I tried, just once, to be as smart as he was?

Wonder why mamma tells pa he is cross when he comes home at night and says his tea is weak, and ties a handkerchief over my mouth so that I can neither speak or breathe because I happen to say she is cross?

Wonder what made pa say that wicked word when Betsy upset the ink all over his papers, and then snapped my ears because I said the same thing, when my kite string broke?

Oh dear! there are lots of things that I want to know! How I wish I was a man!

DO DAILY AND HOURLY YOUR DUTY; do it patiently, thoroughly. Do it as it presents itself; do it at the moment, and let it be its own reward. Never mind whether it is known or acknowledged or not, but do not fail to do it. Do not think of yourself as a mortal, but as an immortal. Fear nothing but [illegible]. Fear nothing but a mean action.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*. For Cash Only.

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols, $1 50. [illegible]

SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY ([illegible]) $1 [illegible]

AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol. $ 75. [illegible]

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS

FOR THE MILLIONS.

I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. By WILLIAM GOODELL.

A summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Le*[illegible] [illegible] from the highest authorities [illegible] prefixed [illegible]. AN APPENDIX contains extracts from State [illegible] and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the North-west Territory; *also* sentiments of the Rev[illegible] &c.

PRICE, Single Copies, [illegible] cents, if by mail [illegible] any number [illegible]s.
[illegible], by mail, $1 [illegible] at the office.
[illegible], by mail, $1 [illegible] $1 [illegible] at the Office.
[illegible] by mail $[illegible] $1.40 at the office.
[illegible] by mail [illegible] $2 [illegible] at the office.
[illegible] WILLIAM GOODELL, or S. B. WILLIAMS, Office [illegible] Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, Cash, always in advance.

N.B. All postage on Books, Pamphlets and [illegible] at our Post Office in *advance* so that we [illegible] as above without having [illegible] price [illegible] publication.

☞ We have no books, pamphlets or tracts for sale except these advertised above, and [illegible] not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.